REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-15, 17-52, 56-66, and 68-103 are pending, with claims 1, 27, 52, 78, and 103 being independent. Claims 2-4, 16, 53-55, and 67 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 27, 52, 78, and 103 have been amended. Support for the amendment is found, for example, on page 5, lines 1-15 and in Fig. 7. No new matter has been introduced.

Examiner Interview

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Duran for the courtesy of an interview conducted on August 20, 2009. This reply reflects the substance of the interview.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claims 1 and 27 now recite, "storing the at least one ad on an advertising server." Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 5-15, 17-26- 28, 30-52, 56-66, 68-77, 79, and 81-103 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. 6,799,326 ("Boylan") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0047297 ("Wen"). Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection because none of the references describe or suggest the limitations of the amended independent claims.

Claim 1 has been amended and now recites accepting at least one ad. Each ad is associated with at least one descriptive category, and the ad configured to be embedded in a Web page of a content publisher and provided by an advertising server. A document to which an accepted ad is linked is identified. The document represents a landing page related to the ad to be embedded in the Web page. Neither Boylan, Wen, nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests these limitations.

The Office Action recognizes that Boylan fails to describe or suggest the previous instance of these limitations in noting:

Applicant : Brian Axe et al.
Serial No. : 10/656,917
Filed : September 5, 2003
Page : 17 of 19

Attorney's Docket No.: 16113-0768001

> **Boylan does not explicitly disclose: identifying a document to which an accepted ad is linked; analyzing content in the document; identifying, based on analyzing the content in the document, at least one entry; adding the entry to the blocking category of ads to be blocked if the entry relates to the least one blocking category of ads to be blocked; preventing an ad from being served if at least a predetermined number of its at least one descriptive category match any of the at least one blocking category of ads to be blocked, wherein the at least one descriptive category associated with the ad is determined from the content of the document. See pages 3 and 4.**

In addressing these limitations, the Office Action relies on Wen. Wen describes an advertising brokering system that creates advertisements with particular characteristics. For example, paragraph 0059 describes that a particular advertisement is categorized as relating to "auto," "travel" and "financial." Wen describes a variety of advertisements. For example, Wen indicates that advertisements may include rich media files and applets. See paragraph 0028. However, in describing how advertisements are placed, Wen indicates that only the placed advertisement is analyzed. See, e.g., paragraphs 0058 and 0065. As such, Wen fails to describe or suggest, "accepting at least one ad, each ad being associated with at least one descriptive category, the ad configured to be embedded in a Web page of a content publisher and provided by an advertising server" and then "identifying a document to which an accepted ad is linked, the document representing a landing page related to the ad to be embedded in the Web page." The secondary references relied upon in the Office Action also do not describe or suggest this limitation. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 52 has been amended and now recites, "ii) at least one ad, each ad being associated with at least one descriptive category, the ad configured to be embedded in a Web page of a content publisher and provided by an advertising server; iii) a document to which an accepted ad is linked, the document representing a landing page related to the ad to be embedded in the Web page." Independent claim 103 has been amended and now recites, "receive user input indicating a digital advertisement, the advertisement being distributed with content distributed to viewers over the distribution network, the ad configured to be embedded in a Web page of a content publisher and provided by an advertising server; identify a document to which the digital advertisement is linked, the document representing a landing page related to the

ad to be embedded in the Web page." Claims 52 and 103 are believed to be allowable for the reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Boylan in view of Wen and Dedrick

Claims 27 and 78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being rendered obvious by Boylan in view of Wen and U.S. Patent No. 5,724,521 ("Dedrick").

Independent claim 27 has been amended and now recites, "accepting at least one ad, each ad being associated with at least one descriptive category, the ad configured to be embedded in a Web page of a content publisher and provided by an advertising server ... [and] comparing the landing page of each of the at least one ad with the document using the comparison function." Independent claim 78 has been amended and now recites, "means for comparing the landing page of each of the at least one ad with the document using the comparison function." Neither Boylan nor Wen describes this limitation for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Dedrick was relied upon for disclosure of limitations that recites "adjusting a weight of each of the at least one blocking category in a comparison function" in column 2, lines 10-20, and does not describe or suggest the limitations appearing in amended independent claims 27 and 78. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Boylan in view of Wen, Dedrick and Bangalore

Claims 29 and 80 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being rendered obvious by Boylan in view of Wen, Dedrick, and Bangalore, Srinivas and Rambow, Owen, "Exploiting a Probabilistic Hierarchical Model for Generation", In: Proceedings of the 18th Conference on Computational Linguistics (COLING '2000), July 31-August 4, 2000 ("Bangalore").

Claims 29 and 80 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from the independent claims. Moreover, for the same reasons as explained with respect to claim 27 and 78, Bangalore does not teach or suggest "accepting at least one ad, each ad being associated with at least one descriptive category, the ad configured to be embedded in a Web page of a content publisher and provided by an advertising server ... [and] comparing the landing page of each of the at least one ad with the document using the comparison function," as recited in amended

claim 27. Similarly, Bangalore does not teach or suggest, "means for comparing the landing page of each of the at least one ad with the document using the comparison function," as recited in amended claim 78. Accordingly, at least for the above reasons, Applicants respectfully ask for reconsideration and withdrawal of rejections of claims 29 and 80.

Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

The $130 Extension of Time fee is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. No other fees are believed due. Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/26/200ₒ

Thomas A. Rozylowicz
Reg. No. 50,620

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945

40583628.doc